

**REMARKS**

This Amendment addresses the issues raised by the Examiner in the Advisory Action mailed May 2, 2006. This amendment is to be entered in place of the April 19, 2006, amendment, previously filed, which was not entered by the Examiner. Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given this case and for the allowance of Claim 1. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants feel that all outstanding issues have been addressed and prompt allowance of all remaining claims is respectfully requested.

**Allowed Claim 1**

In the May 2, 2006, Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Applicants' arguments with respect to the Claim 1 were persuasive and that Claim 1 is allowed over the prior art of record. See Office Action at 4. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's reconsideration of this issue and are interested in issuing the patent application according to Claim 1.

Through the above amendments, Applicants have attempted to bring each of the remaining independent claims in line with the allowed Claim 1. Since all of the claims now carry at least the distinguishing features already accepted by the Examiner (with respect to Claim 1), each and every remaining claim is in condition for final allowance, and prompt notice to such effect is respectfully requested.

Specifically, the Examiner indicated that independent apparatus Claims 9 and 23 do not recite that the device is "untethered" from the surface for purposes of providing power and control signals to the device "within the body of the claim." Although the term "untethered" previously only existed in the preamble of

these claims (see, e.g., Claim 23), Applicants believed that this was an active claim limitation because it defined elements that appeared within the body of the claim.

However, in order to bring this prosecution to a successful conclusion, Applicants have amended both Claims 9 and 23 to include the distinguishing limitations already existing in allowed Claim 1. Clearly now, the device provides both power to and control of the work tool through onboard supplies rather than through the use of a tether. Through these amendments, each of the independent claims is of a similar scope and distinguishes from the prior art in at least the ways indicated with respect to allowed Claim 1. Therefore, each and every claim is in condition for final allowance.

**Claim Rejections § 103(a)**


Through the above amendments, Claims 9 and 23 have been brought in line with allowed Claim 1, and each of the remaining claims now distinguishes over the cited prior art in at least the same ways as Claim 1. The rejection has therefore been mooted by these amendments.

The above claim amendments and accompanying remarks address each and every concern raised by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicants believe that all remaining claims of the present invention are now in condition for final allowance. If the Examiner feels that any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney at the contact information below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 16, 2006

By

  
Robert D. Kucler  
Reg. No. 45,908

REED SMITH LLP  
P.O. Box 488  
Pittsburgh, PA 15230-0488  
(412) 288-4598

Attorney for Applicants